



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,977	04/01/2004	Lili Cheng	MS305641.01 / MSFTP658US	1591
27195 7590 01/11/2008 AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			EXAMINER SALOMON, PHENUEL S	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 01/11/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
osteuball@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/816,977

Applicant(s)

CHENG ET AL.

Examiner

Phenuel S. Salomon

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 12-20 and 22-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 12-20 and 22-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 November 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment file on, November 28, 2007.
2. Claims 1, 14, 23 and 31 are amended; claims 9, 11, 21 and 37 are cancelled; and claims 1-8, 10, 12-20, and 22-36 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 6-7, 12-16, 19-20, 22-23, 25, 28-31, 33 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being anticipated by Scully et al. (US 4,831,552) in view of Osterberg Jr. et al. (US 2003/0191806 A1).

Claim 1: Scully discloses a system that facilitates the generation of an event document for a user, comprising the following components stored in computer memory and executable by a processor:

an access component that accesses a plurality of disparate data sources for event information related to an event (col. 4, lines 14-21); and

a consolidation component that consolidates the event information to generate an event document (col. 22, lines 18-40), but does not explicitly disclose customized to a user within an organizational chart, the event document presents the event information such that prospective attendee profiles are arranged in a decreasing order of their respective organizational chart distance from the user. However, Osterberg discloses an organizational hierarchy that comprises identifiers and information relating to positions of the members and their relationship to other members in the same group (p. 1, para [0009]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Osterberg's teaching in Scully. One would have been motivated to do so in order to filter the event information according to participants rank and relations to each other in a particular group within the organization.

Claim 2: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system as in claim 1 above, Scully further discloses the data sources are at least one of public and private (col.2, lines 67-68 and col. 3, lines 1-4).

Claim 3: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system as in claim 1 above; Scully further discloses the event document is a meeting preparation report (col. 3, lines 6-12).

Claim 6: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system as in claim 1 above, Scully further discloses the event document is a single page document (composite screen) (col. 4, lines 2-3).

Claim 7: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system as in claim 3 above; Scully further discloses the report is formatted to present the event information in a predetermined way (col.22, lines 31-40).

Claim 12: Scully and Osterberg disclose a computer that employs the system as in claim 1 above (see fig. 1) in Scully.

Claim 13: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system as in claim 1 above, Scully further discloses a classifier (structured field) that automates a feature by making an inference based on one or more data associated with the event (col. 6, lines 6-49).

Claim 14: Scully discloses a system that facilitates the generation of an event document, comprising the following components stored on computer memory and executed by a processor:

an access component that accesses at least one of a public data source and a private data source for event information related to an event (col. 4, lines 14-21);

an event component that detects a trigger (col. 22, lines 54-61); and

a consolidation component that compiles and consolidates the event information into a meeting document based on the occurrence of a trigger (col. 22, lines 54-67 and col. 23, lines 11-17), but Scully does not explicitly disclose associated with a user within an organizational chart, wherein profiles for the event attendees are arranged in descending order of their respective organizational chart distance from the user. However, Osterberg discloses an organizational hierarchy that comprises identifiers and information

relating to positions of the members and their relationship to other members in the same group (p. 1, para [0009]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Osterberg's teaching in Scully. One would have been motivated to do so in order to filter the event information according to participants rank and relations to each other in a particular group within the organization.

Claim 15: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system as in claim 14 above, Scully further discloses the meeting document is prepared for the event (col.23, lines 1-5).

Claim 16: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system as in claim 14 above, Scully further discloses the trigger is a manual option selected to cause generation of the meeting report (col. 22, lines 54-61).

Claim 19: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system as in claim 14 above, Scully further discloses the meeting document is generated in a personalized format for a given user (col.22, lines 47-53).

Claim 20: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system as in claim 14 above, Scully further discloses a portion of the event information is derived by searching the contents of at least one of e-mail and a document associated with a meeting attendee (col. 24, lines 8-18).

Claim 22: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system as in claim 14 above, Scully further discloses the event information includes at least one of a link to an e-mail related to the event, a distribution list, and a point-to-point connection (col.24, lines 8-13).

Claim 23: Scully discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method of generating a meeting preparation document, comprising:

receiving a request to generate the meeting preparation document (col. 22, lines 17-19);

accessing at least one of a public data source and a private data source to retrieve relevant meeting information (col.2, lines 67-68 and col. 3, lines 1-4);

generating the meeting preparation document according to the personalized format (col.22, lines 47-53).

arranging the relevant meeting information into a personalized format of a user (col.22, lines 47-53), but does not explicitly disclose for a user present in an organizational chart wherein profiles attendees are arranged according to their respective decreasing organizational chart distance relative to the user. However, Osterberg discloses an organizational hierarchy that comprises identifiers and information relating to positions of the members and their relationship to other members in the same group (p. 1, para [0009]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Osterberg's teaching in Scully. One would have been motivated to do so in order to filter the event information according to participants rank and relations to each other in a particular group within the organization.

Claim 25: Scully and Osterberg disclose a medium as in claim 23 above, Scully further discloses limiting the meeting preparation document to a single page document (composite screen) (col. 4, lines 2-3).

Claim 28: Scully and Osterberg disclose a medium as in claim 23 above, Scully further discloses generating the meeting preparation document in response to a trigger (col. 22, lines 54-61).

Claim 29: Scully and Osterberg disclose a medium as in claim 23 above, Scully further discloses the trigger occurs in association with at least one of a manual selection initiated by the user, a time, and a change detected in the meeting preparation document (col. 22, lines 54-61).

Claim 30: Scully and Osterberg disclose the medium as in claim 23 above, Scully further discloses limiting the meeting information that is presented to attendees other than the user (col. 22, lines 54-58).

Claim 31: Scully discloses a system that facilitates the generation of a meeting preparation document, comprising:

means for receiving a request to generate the meeting preparation document from a user associated with an organizational chart (col. 22, lines 17-19);

means for accessing at least one of a public data source and a private data source to retrieve relevant meeting information (col.2, lines 67-68 and col. 3, lines 1-4);

means for generating the meeting preparation document according to the personalized format (col.22, lines 47-53);

means for arranging the relevant meeting information further comprising at least a plurality of prospective attendee profiles into a personalized format for the user (col.22, lines 47-53 and col. 23, lines 11-17)),

But Scully does not explicitly disclose the attendee profiles for the meeting are arranged according to their decreasing organizational chart distance relative to the user. However, Osterberg discloses an organizational hierarchy that comprises identifiers and information relating to positions of the members and their relationship to other members in the same group (p. 1, para [0009]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Osterberg's teaching in Scully. One would have been motivated to do so in order to filter the event information according to participants rank and relations to each other in a particular group within the organization.

Claim 32: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system as in claim 31 above, Scully further discloses means for accessing includes accessing means that accesses at least one of e-mail, an image, a shared data source (calendars of a number of users), a user profile, a document relevant to the event, and an e-mail attachment. (col. 2, lines 67-68 and col. 3, lines 1-5).

Claim 33: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system as in claim 31 above, Scully further discloses means for limiting the meeting preparation document to a single page document (composite screen) (col. 4, lines 2-3).

Claim 36: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system as in claim 31 above, Scully further discloses means for automatically generating the meeting preparation document in response to a trigger (col. 22, lines 54-61).

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scully (US 4,831,552) in view of Osterberg Jr. et al. (US 2003/0191806 A1) and in further view of Holtz et al. (US 2003/0001880 A1).

Claim: 10: Scully and Osterberg disclose the system as in claims 1 above, but do not explicitly disclose the event document is generated through an e-mail application and further comprises links to one or more emails relevant to the event retrieved through an email search conducted on one or more of a date of the event or keywords relevant to the event. However, Holtz discloses an hyperlink to related information about a show segment "... (page 24, par.[0316] [cross-referenced and stored information are being generated from archival and retrieval system; therefore, retrieving the pertinent information involves searching. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this feature in Scully. One would have been motivated to do so in order to quickly expedite information related to the event.

6. Claims 4, 5, 17, 24, 27, 32 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scully (US 4,831,552) in view of Osterberg Jr. et al. (US 2003/0191806 A1) and in further view of Doss et al. (US 2003/0046296 A1).

Claims 4, 24 and 32: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system and computer-readable medium as in claims 1, 23 and 31 above, but do not explicitly disclose the data sources include an e-mail attachment. However, Doss discloses a system "where the automated system accesses the dynamic contact database..." (page 1,

par. [0005])). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include e-mail attachment in Scully. One would have been motivated to do so in order to keep the participants informed about schedule change.

Claim 5: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system as in claim 1 above, but do not explicitly disclose the event information includes an image of a user scheduled to attend the event. However, Doss discloses an “iconic representation of a person defining the person’s status” (page 2, par. [0018]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include image of a user in Scully. One would have been motivated to do so in order to better identify the event participants.

Claims: 27 and 35: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system and a computer-readable medium as in claims 23 and 31 above, but do not explicitly disclose the event document is generated through an e-mail application and further comprises links to one or more emails relevant to the event retrieved through an email search conducted on one or more of a date of the event or keywords relevant to the event. However, Doss discloses an “automated system where contact could be established via e-mail”...(page 1, par.[0006]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this feature in Scully. One would have been motivated to do so in order to facilitate a fast distribution of the report.

Claim 17: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system as in claim 14 above, but do not explicitly disclose the data sources include an e-mail attachment. However, Doss discloses a system “where the automated system accesses the dynamic contact database...” (page 1, par. [0005])). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include e-mail

attachment in Scully. One would have been motivated to do so in order to keep the participants informed about schedule change.

7. Claims 8, 18, 26 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scully (US 4,831,552) in view of Osterberg Jr. et al. (US 2003/0191806 A1) and in further view of Estrada (US 7,012,627 B1).

Claim 8: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system as in claim 1 above, but do not explicitly disclose the event document is presented to the user via a browser. However, Estrada discloses a “web navigation system using a browser..”(col. 2, lines 53-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a browser in Scully. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide participants a real dynamic document presentation.

Claim 18: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system as in claim 14 above, but does not explicitly disclose the meeting document is presented to the user via a browser in HTML. However, Estrada discloses a “web navigation system using a browser in HTML..”(col. 2, lines 53-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a browser in HTML format in Scully. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide the user a real dynamic document presentation.

Claims 26 and 34: Scully and Osterberg disclose a system and method as in claim 31 and 23 above, but do not explicitly disclose presenting the meeting preparation document via a browser in an SGML format. However, Estrada discloses a “web navigation system using a browser in HTML” (HTML is derived from SGML, therefore it’s inherent) (col. 2, lines 53-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a browser in SGML format in Scully. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide participants a real dynamic document presentation.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/28/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Mizrahi et al. (US 2003/0227479 A1) discloses large group interactions.
- b. Huemoeller et al. (US 5,855,006) discloses personal activity scheduling apparatus.
- c. Peled et al. (US 2005/0288939 A1) discloses method and system for managing confidential information.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phenuel S. Salomon whose telephone number is (571) 270-1699. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.(Alternate Friday Off) EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Application/Control Number:
10/816,977
Art Unit: 2178

Page 13

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PSS
1/03/2008



Stephen Hong
Supervisory Primary Examiner